Syllogisms and Frame Jobs

A syllogism is an instance of a form of reasoning in which a conclusion is drawn (whether validly or not) from two given or assumed propositions (premises), each of which shares a term with the conclusion, and shares a common or middle term not present in the conclusion (e.g., all dogs are animals; all animals have four legs; therefore all dogs have four legs).

Linking A to C Through B		
Element	**Role**	**Example**
A	Subject (person)	A suspect
B	Mediating link	DNA, fingerprints, motive, surveillance
C	Crime or criminal act	Burglary, fraud, assault

Types of Linkage (B as Mediator)		
Type	**Description**	**Example**
Physical Evidence	Material traces linking A to C	Fingerprints on weapon
Digital Trail	Electronic records connecting A to C	IP address accessing stolen data
Witness Testimony	Eyewitness or hearsay placing A near C	Seen at crime scene
Behavioral Pattern	Prior conduct suggesting likelihood of C	Similar past offenses

Linking A to C Through B		
Element	**Role**	**Example**
A	Subject (person)	A suspect
B	Mediating link	DNA, fingerprints, motive, surveillance
C	Crime or criminal act	Burglary, fraud, assault

Types of Linkage (B as Mediator)		
Type	**Description**	**Example**
Physical Evidence	Material traces linking A to C	Fingerprints on weapon
Digital Trail	Electronic records connecting A to C	IP address accessing stolen data
Witness Testimony	Eyewitness or hearsay placing A near C	Seen at crime scene

Type	Description	Example
Behavioral Pattern	Prior conduct suggesting likelihood of C	Similar past offenses
Circumstantial Presence	*Non-dispositive link; may be coincidental*	*Both the culprit and the wrongly accused were at the scene*
Confesion of Culprit	Links the suspect to the crime	Someone has confessed to the crime but it does not seem credible

🧭 Commentary: Evaluating the Mediating Link (B)

In legal and investigative reasoning, the mediating link **(B)** between a person **(A)** and a crime **(C)** is often the focal point of analysis. However, not all links are dispositive. Some may be circumstantial, coincidental, or insufficient to establish guilt.

⚠️ Circumstantial Evidence Is Not Proof

Consider the following example:

> *Both the culprit and the wrongly accused were present at the location. The wrongly accused being at the scene (the mediating link) is only circumstantial evidence.*

This illustrates that presence alone does not equate to culpability. The link (B) must be assessed for:

- **Strength**: How direct or indirect is the connection?
- **Exclusivity**: Could others share the same link?
- **Context**: Is the link explained by innocent behavior?

🔄 Dialectical Implications

When B is weak or ambiguous, the synthesis between A and C collapses. Competing narratives emerge:

- **Defense**: Challenges the validity or interpretation of B.
- **Prosecution**: Argues B is sufficient to infer C from A.

Thus, the mediating link is not just a connector—it is a site of contestation, interpretation, and narrative construction.